

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

By this amendment, claim 14 has been amended as discussed in detail below and claim 29 has been added.

On page 5 of the Office Action, Claims 19-28 were allowed.

Beginning on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,483,491) in view of Kasahara (JP2001-006562) and Amemiya (US 6,525,470). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 14 recites a plurality of transparent float electrodes, and that the float electrode in each cell is separated from the float electrode in the other cells. None of the prior art relied on by the Examiner discloses or in any way suggested such float electrodes.

The float electrodes of the present invention are not strips running through plural cells. In order to further emphasize that the float electrodes are separated from one another, claim 14 has been amended to recite that the float electrode in each cell is electrically separated from the other float electrodes in the other cells.

With regard to Lee, the Examiner states that “the float electrode in each cell being separated from the float electrode in other cell (cell being considered to be discharge space in between two adjacent display electrodes and the address electrode)” see page 3, lines 5-7 of Office Action. However, this is not correct. In the panel of Lee, the float electrodes 130 in each cell are **not** separated from the other float electrodes in the other cells. Rather, as is true with all of the electrodes shown by Lee (16, 16', 17, 17', 22, 111, 112, 111', 112', 210, and 210'), the auxiliary electrode 130 is a strip that runs through plural cells. This is true because in the same conventional manner that pulses are sent from outside the panel through the scan and address electrodes, Lee also discloses applying a pulse to the auxiliary electrode 130 (see column 5, lines 32-38). Therefore, the auxiliary electrode 130 of Lee is continuous though a plurality of cells to outside the panel in order to enable application of the pulse. Lee does not disclose the electrode 130 as a separate electrode

in each cell electrically separated from the other float electrodes in the other cells as recited in Claim 14.

The secondary reference Kasahara also does not disclose a separate transparent electrode in each cell being electrically separated from the other float electrodes in the other cells, but rather shows a float electrode 17 as a strip crossing many cells.

The third reference Amemiya, does not disclose, (and was not relied on by the Examiner as disclosing), a separate transparent float electrode in each cell being electrically separated from the other float electrodes in the other cells.

Accordingly, none of the applied references discloses or suggests a transparent float electrode in each cell which is electrically separated from the other float electrodes in the other cells. Therefore no combination of the disclosures of Lee, Kasahara, and Amemiya would result in the invention recited in claim 14 of the present application.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that claims 14-18 are allowable over the prior art of record and that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Haruhiro YUKI et al.

By: 

Jeffrey R. Filipek

Registration No. 41,471

Attorney for Applicants

JRF/fs
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 3, 2006